

186.1004.01

REMARKS:Status

Claims 1 to 32 are pending. Claims 1, 17 and 21 are the independent claims.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 7 to 21, and 26 to 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0013123 (Freeman). Claims 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Freeman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,191 (Balabanovic). Claims 4 and 24 were rejected under § 103(a) over Freeman in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0028380 (Freeland). Claims 5, 6, 22, 23 and 25 were rejected under § 103(a) over Freeman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,532 (Feinleib). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Discussion

Effective Date of Freeman: Applicants note that the application for Freeman was filed on Jan. 22, 2001, which is after the Aug. 7, 2000, filing date of the present application. Applicants also note that Freeman is a continuation-in-part application that claims priority from U.S. Patent App. No. 09/335,372, which was filed on Jun. 17, 1999. Applicants have noted that U.S. Patents No. 6,181,334 and No. 5,724,091 from which Freeman also claims priority contain disclosures that differ significantly from Freeman's. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

186.1004.01

a copy of U.S. Patent App. No. 09/335,372 so that Applicants can verify that the portions of Freeman being applied against the claims find support in that parent application.

Effective Date of Freeland: Applicants note that the application for Freeland was filed on Aug. 2, 2002. Applicants also note that Freeman is a continuation application that claims priority from U.S. Patent App. No. PCT/AU01/00111, which was filed on Feb. 2, 2001. Both of these filing dates are after the Aug. 7, 2000, filing date of the present application. Accordingly, Freeland does not appear to Applicants to be applicable art. Withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested of all rejections based in part on Freeland.

Claims 1 to 16: Claim 1 as amended is reproduced below:

1. A method for customizing a structured document for delivery to an internet appliance, comprising:
identifying information units in said structured document;
selecting one or more of said information units for delivery;
creating in a database a second structured document including said one or more of said information units, said second structured document customized for delivery to said internet appliance; and
delivering said second structured document to said internet appliance.

The art applied against claim 1, namely Freeman, is not seen by Applicants to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of that claim, at least with respect to "said second structured document customized for delivery to said internet appliance."

Applicants note that the rejection of claim 1 does not even specifically allege that Freeman teaches this feature. No portion of Freeman is cited as teaching the feature.

Freeman does teach customized program creation. However, Freeman's customized programming stream is created "to reinforce known or educated assumptions of

186.1004.01

programming and commercial selections that are most pertinent to the particular user, bringing some personalization to the vast library of stored programs and information.” Freeman, Abstract. Freeman teaches monitoring of a user’s viewing habits and cataloguing of user responses to interactive programming queries when generating a profile used for customization. See Freeman, paras. [0014] and [0074]. Furthermore, Freeman states that the purpose of the customized programming creation system is “to provide one or more users, on an individual basis, programming calculated to be of particular interest to each user.” Freeman, para. [0027]. This customization does not appear to Applicants to be customization for delivery to an internet appliance.

Freeman does discuss the possibility of delivery of customized content to “a wide variety of devices such as, for example, a personal computer, a television, a cable receiver, a satellite receiver, a video game console, and a personal digital assistant.” Freeman, para. [0083]. However, Applicants see no mention in Freeman of customizing content for delivery to a particular one of these devices.

Applicants have reviewed the remaining references applied in this case and see nothing therein that remedies the foregoing deficiencies of Freeman. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 17 to 20: Claim 17 is reproduced below:

17. A database comprising:
a user record identifying a user;
a device record identifying an internet appliance;

186.1004.01

a client record identifying a browser running on said internet appliance;
a user_client record associating said user record with said client record; and
a device profile record associating said user_client record with said device record.

The art applied against claim 17, namely Freeman, is not seen by Applicants to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of that claim, at least with respect to the recited client, user_client, and device profile records.

The Office Action did not even allege that Freeman discloses the recited records, but rather grouped claim 17 in with the rejection of claim 1. No portion of Freeman was cited as teaching the records.

Freeman does discuss "a 'donut' of dynamic, hierarchical, shared user profile information." Freeman, para. [0083]. However, Applicants sees no mention in Freeman of including identification of a browser running on an internet appliance in such a donut. Thus, Freeman is not seen by Applicants to teach the recited client record that identifies a browser running on an internet appliance.

Applicants submit that without teaching the client record, Freeman cannot teach the recited user_client record that associates a user record with the client record. Likewise, without teaching the user_client record, Freeman cannot teach the recited device profile record that associates the user_client record with a device record.

For at least the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejections of claim 17 and its dependent claims.

186.1004.01

Claims 21 to 32: Claim 21 is reproduced below:

21. A document customization system, comprising:
a management server offering a document customization service to a user;
a document manager associated with said management server for performing said document customization service to structured documents identified by said user, said document customization service customizing said structured documents for delivery to an internet appliance;
a database accessible by said document manager, said database storing customized structured documents resulting from said document manager performing said document customization service; and
a portal for accessing said customized structured documents in said database.

The art applied against claim 21, namely Freeman, is not seen by Applicants to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of that claim, at least with respect to "said document customization service customizing said structured documents for delivery to an internet appliance." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejections of claim 21 and its dependent claims.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

186.1004.01

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 486-3585. All
correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: July 15, 2004

Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Swernofsky Law Group PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700